

RESPONDENT PROFILE: 2004 SURVEY SAMPLE

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	SURVEY SAMPLE	(N=)
FULL SAMPLE		100%	402
AREA	City Council District 1	13%	54
	City Council District 2	18%	74
	City Council District 3	22%	89
	City Council District 4	26%	105
	City Council District 5	20%	80
SEX	Male	48%	193
	Female	52%	209
AGE	Less than 25 Years	6%	23
	26 - 35 Years	15%	60
	36 - 45 Years	19%	76
	46 - 55 Years	19%	78
	56 - 65 Years	16%	63
	Over 65 Years	25%	101
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE	Under 1 Year	2%	7
	1 - 3 Years	13%	51
	4 - 6 Years	9%	36
	7 - 10 Years	8%	33
	Over 10 Years	68%	273
AGE RANGE OF CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME	No Children	45%	179
(MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)	Under 6 Years of Age	15%	60
	6 - 12 Years of Age	17%	68
	13 - 18 Years of Age	16%	64
	19 and Above	26%	103

RESPONDENT PROFILE COMPARISON: 1998 - 2004

RESPONDENT GROUP	SUBGROUP	1998 SAMPLE	2001 SAMPLE	2004 SAMPLE
FULL SAMPLE		N=401	N=400	N=402
AREA	City Council District 1	15%	14%	13%
	City Council District 2	17%	17%	18%
	City Council District 3	20%	21%	22%
	City Council District 4	26%	25%	26%
	City Council District 5	22%	23%	20%
SEX	Male	46%	40%	48%
	Female	54%	60%	52%
AGE	Less than 25 Years	7%	7%	6%
	26 - 35 Years	22%	15%	15%
	36 - 45 Years	26%	19%	19%
	46 - 55 Years	18%	19%	19%
	56 - 65 Years	11%	15%	16%
	Over 65 Years	16%	25%	25%
LENGTH OF RESIDENCE	Under 1 Year	3%	1%	2%
	2 - 4 Years (1 - 3 Years)*	28%	12%*	13%
	5 - 7 Years (4 - 6 Years)*	14%	11%*	9%
	8 - 10 Years (7 - 10 Years)*	13%	12%*	8%
	Over 10 Years	42%	65%	68%
AGE RANGE OF CHILDREN LIVING AT HOME	No Children	54%	44%	45%
(MULTIPLE RESPONSES ALLOWED)	Under 6 Years of Age	22%	12%	15%
	6 - 12 Years of Age	25%	17%	17%
	13 - 18 Years of Age	22%	17%	16%
	19 And Above	NA	30%	26%

CONTACT PROFILE

The sample contact universe was composed of households in the city of Bryan with telephone numbers, purchased from a consumer list maintained and updated by Experian, formerly TRW Marketing Services. The consumer list was compared to a city list that contained the city council district designation number for each household. Therefore, the list could be accurately divided into the five city council subsectors. This methodology was the same process utilized for the two previous surveys. The following summarizes the effectiveness of telephone contact.

TYPE OF CONTACT	%	(N=)
TOTAL POSSIBLE CONTACTS	100%	6,381
TOTAL CONTACTS MADE	100%	4,356
COMPLETED	9%	400
ANSWERING MACHINE	25%	1,105
REFUSE TO ANSWER	12%	531
NO ANSWER	14%	592
WRONG NUMBER	24%	1,031
CALL BACK	11%	496
BUSY	3%	148
DISCONTINUED INTERVIEW	1%	53

AREA DESIGNATION MAP CITY OF BRYAN

AREA		DESCRIPTION
1	-	Council District 1
2	-	Council District 2
3	-	Council District 3
4	-	Council District 4
5	-	Council District 5

OVERVIEW

A critical component of the city's Policy Governance set of rules and guidelines is ongoing monitoring and the citizen survey is one of the tools used by the city to monitor performance. Beginning in 1998, and again in 2001 and 2004, the City of Bryan commissioned the public opinion research firm of Raymond Turco & Associates to conduct its periodic survey of citizen attitudes and to evaluate public opinion as it relates to policy governance. The comprehensive questionnaire (see Appendix) was designed to mirror the two previous surveys in order to build upon the trending data developed since the benchmark survey. Issues that were studied included city services, employee relations, city-related initiatives and other topics impacting the city. The information gathered in this report will allow elected officials and city staff to better understand how the general citizenry views issues such as city services, customer service, future public improvements and overall satisfaction with life in Bryan. Additionally, the enhanced trending data will allow the city to track improvements or declines in citizen attitudes.

The survey investigated the following areas of interest:

1. General Attitudes About Bryan

- ☒ Level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with quality of life in city
- ☒ Level of community improvement
- ☒ Level of community involvement
- ☒ Positive aspects of Bryan
- ☒ Most critical issue facing Bryan
- ☒ Level of usefulness of city sources providing local information
- ☒ Level of support or opposition to allocating additional city funds for selected communication improvements
- ☒ How residents get information about activities in Bryan
- ☒ Sources utilized to gather information in Bryan

2. City Characteristics And City Services

- ☒ Rating of city services
- ☒ Quality ratings to aspects of neighborhood maintenance
- ☒ Quality ratings to how city is maintained
- ☒ Frequency of contact with city employees



- ☒ Level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with customer service activities (subsample of people with contact)
- ☒ Suggestions to improve overall quality of service provided by city
- ☒ Level of agreement or disagreement with service-related statements

3. Quality Of Life And City Initiatives

- ☒ Element which best describes quality of life
- ☒ Level of importance of general activities towards determining quality of life in community
- ☒ Level of satisfaction with general activities
- ☒ Level of agreement or disagreement with governance-related statements
- ☒ Level of agreement or disagreement with city cultural diversity statement
- ☒ Service or facility for city to provide
- ☒ Rating of taxes paid to taxing entities (school district, city, county)
- ☒ Quality performance rating for current Bryan city council
- ☒ Level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with city council activities
- ☒ Most important issue for Bryan to address during the next year

The following is a summary of the key findings concerning these areas.

KEY FINDINGS

Raymond Turco & Associates conducted the city's periodic citizen attitude survey during a 9-day period of March, 2004. Continuing the pattern established in 1998, this scientific public opinion poll captured attitudes on a full spectrum of city issues and city-related initiatives. Respondents were randomly selected from phone matched households. The full sample of 402 residents was interviewed with a comprehensive questionnaire (see Appendix) originally developed in 1998 and enhanced in subsequent years. The survey itself collected attitudinal data on diverse issues such as city services, city characteristics, customer service, quality of life attributes and other city-related issues. The tabulations were then analyzed to assist elected and appointed officials in understanding public sentiment concerning these subjects. In addition, as this is the third time this survey has been conducted, trends are more easily discernible, since the results can be compared over a three-result period.

The telephone survey included the responses of 402 individuals. Below are listed the highlights from our analysis of the project:

TRENDING QUALITY OF LIFE

- ♦ **More than nine of ten (92%) said they were satisfied (61%) or very satisfied (31%) with the quality of life in their community, compared to fewer than 1 in ten (6%) who said they were dissatisfied (5%) or very dissatisfied (1%). The ratio of satisfaction to dissatisfaction in this year's survey was 15.3 positive responses to every one negative perception. Since the benchmark year, satisfaction has hovered around the 92 percentile (91%-94%-92%), with all three percentages falling within the standard margin of error. It should be noted that although overall satisfaction has remained consistently high, intense satisfaction, or the level of passion, has declined eight points since the benchmark (39%-34%-31%), indicating a lower degree of enthusiasm, but not to the point where it shifts to dissatisfaction. The 2004 ratio (15.3:1) was slightly lower than in 2001 (15.7:1), but higher than in 1998 (13.0:1). Improvements in satisfaction ratings since 1998 were noticed in Districts 1 (83%-92%-87%), 2 (89%-88%-92%), 4 (93%-98%-96%), and 5 (88%-93%-89%). The only location in which positive attitudes declined was in District 3 (96%-95%-95%) and that was only by one point, which is statistically insignificant. The 2004 ratio of satisfaction to dissatisfaction was 32.0:1 in District 4 and 23.8:1 in District 3, the two highest areas. After that, the ratio dropped to 15.3:1 in District 2,**

and then again to 8.9:1 in District 5 and finally, 7.9:1 in District 1. (See Figure 1, page 29.)

- ♦ **Nearly two in three (64%) rated Bryan improved, while 27% considered it to be the same and 8% rated it as worse. Just one percent gave a no opinion response. The 64% was an improvement over the 2001 results (60%) but still lower than in the benchmark survey (69%). At the same time, the percentage rating the community the same (19%-28%-27%) stabilized, while the percentage rating Bryan worse (9%-10%-8%) has remained consistent throughout.** Although the overall "improved" ratings have exhibited nominal variance, the subsector results have been anything but consistent. For example, in Districts 1 (51%-75%-59%) and 2 (70%-51%-69%), percentages have climbed or dropped by more than 15 points each survey. Comparatively, in District 3 (70%-60%-66%) and District 4 (72%-63%-68%), positive viewpoints have declined four percent over the benchmark findings, with both improving five percent since 2001. Residents in District 5 (73%-55%-57%) are markedly different from the benchmark year, with findings over the past two surveys similar to each other and both significantly less than originally. (See Figure 2, page 32.)
- ♦ **Fifteen percent of residents rated themselves very active in the community, and 47% stayed somewhat informed, for a combined activity rating of 62%. Comparatively, 15% said they became involved when issues affected them and 21% just lived in the city, for a total of 36% inactivity. The remaining two percent chose the no opinion response. The 62% combined active rating is a significant improvement over 2001 results (47%), more in line with the benchmark results (59%). Note that since 1998, very active (15%-12%-15%) and became involved when issues affected them (19%-18%-15%) have remained fairly consistent. What has not has been the percentage who consider themselves somewhat informed (44%-35%-47%) or else just lived in the city (20%-34%-21%).** Between 1998 and 2004, residents in Districts 1 (49%-28%-65%) and 5 (61%-43%-66%) have seen combined activity shift significantly each time a survey was conducted. There was more consistency elsewhere in the city, although residents in Districts 2 (53%-43%-51%), 3 (64%-56%-61%), and 4 (63%-58%-68%) continue to show varying degrees of activity each year. When compared to 1998, three zones consider themselves to be more active: Districts 1 (49%-65%), 4 (63%-68%), and 5 (61%-66%).
- ♦ **Good place to live/neighborhood quality (27%), small town atmosphere (14%), friendly people (13%), and good schools and low cost of living (both 10%) were the most popular answers people would relay to a friend who was considering moving into the area. When compared to the previous survey results, the comment good place to live/neighborhood quality**

nearly doubled (15%-16%-27%), to where it was the most popular comment this year. More people also focused on the low cost of living (3%-5%-10%). Remarks about good schools (13%-16%-10%), small-town atmosphere (12%-13%-14%), and nice people (14%-11%-13%) have remained consistently favorable with only a minimal variance. District 2 focused on two aspects, that it was a good place to live/neighborhood quality (41%) and good schools (13%). The next most popular item was low cost of living, with 9%. In District 4, three items were of equally positive mention: good place to live/neighborhood quality, small-town atmosphere, and friendly people (each 21%). Good place to live/neighborhood quality was along the lines of friendly people (27% and 24%) in District 1. In District 3, the top comments were good place to live/neighborhood quality (29%), followed by good schools and small-town atmosphere (both 16%). Among District 5 survey participants, the top responses were good place to live/neighborhood quality (21%), small-town atmosphere (16%), and friendly people (15%). (See Table #2, page 37.)

- ♦ **Road improvement/traffic congestion (17%), school issues (14%), crime/drugs/gangs and high taxes (both 11%), and city government issues/council (10%) were identified as the most critical issues facing the city. Over the course of six years, the survey results show growth-related issues (19%-11%-7%) and crime/drugs/gangs (26%-15%-11%) to be less critical in the eyes of survey participants. Instead, residents have grown more concerned with road improvements/traffic congestion (10%-22%-17%), although less than in 2001, city government issues/council (5%-4%-10%), and industrial/economic growth (0%-10%-7%). Concern with school issues (10%-17%-11%) was much greater last time but now more in line with the benchmark results.** Districts 1 (27% and 18%) and 2 (21% and 13%) focused more on crime/drugs/gangs than road improvements/traffic congestion, which they ranked second. In District 3, the primary issue tied for second (14%), along with high taxes, both of which were behind school issues (20%). The ranking in District 4 was road improvements/traffic congestion (20%), followed closely by school issues (16%), high taxes (15%), industrial/economic growth (14%), and city government issues/council (13%). The issue of road improvement/traffic congestion was identified as most critical in District 5, along with city government issues/council (both 16%), followed by school issues and high taxes (both 10%). Citywide variances were evident for several of the top concerns, including school issues not being critical in District 2 (6%, to 20% in District 3), crime/drugs/gangs of little concern everywhere except Districts 1 and 2 (4%-6%, to 27% and 21%), and taxes not being an issue on which people in District 1 focused (2%, to 15% in District 4). (See Table #3, page 41.)

- ♦ **City staff (69%-28%, 3.6:1), City Council (67%-24%, 2.8:1), and the city web site (51%-28%, 1.8:1) were the city sources rated most useful, as determined by the ratio of useful to not useful findings. The ratio for the other three sources were 1.1:1 (44%-40% for annual city budget), 1.5:1 (52%-35% for cable television Channel 16), and 1.5:1 (52%-34% for televised City Council meetings). All six sources scored higher overall useful ratings in 2004 than when compared to the benchmark results, as well as five of six between 2001 and 2004. In terms of combined very and somewhat useful findings, the most significant improvements were with the city web site (31%-51%), city staff (61%-69%), and both cable television, Channel 16 and televised City Council meetings (both 46%-52%). Comparatively, the other items grew five (39%-44% for annual city budget report) and three (64%-67% for City Council) percent, respectively. Current survey results showed that in District 1, each source was listed useful or very useful by a majority of residents sampled. This was not the case elsewhere, as one in District 2, two in District 3, three in District 5, and four in District 4 failed to attain majority useful percentages. The only two sources to be rated useful by a majority of residents citywide were city staff (68%-69%-75%-70%-65%) and City Council (71%-66%-67%-66%-62%). How useful a particular source was varied throughout the city. For example, cable television, Channel 16, achieved a 69% useful rating in District 2, 27 points higher than in District 5 (44%). In comparing current findings to benchmark results, the following sources have demonstrated improved useful ratings in each survey: the city budget report (39%-43%-59%), City Council (56%-65%-71%), the city web site (36%-46%-59%), and televised City Council meetings (41%-57%-61%) in District 1; the city web site (27%-52%-56%) in District 2; nothing in District 3; the city web site (30%-39%-45%) in District 4; and cable television (30%-44%-45%), annual city budget report (29%-34%-40%), and the city web site (20%-36%-58%) in District 5. (See Tables #4 - #6, pages 44 - 47.)**
- ♦ **Regular publication of city newsletters and mail pieces (72%-22%, 3.3:1) and expanding telephone accessible information relative to various city services (66%-26%) were the communication activities most strongly supported by residents for allocating additional city funding. Less support was voiced regarding spending city funds to expand the city's web page (56%-29%, 1.9:1) or improvements in programming to the city's public access cable channel (53%-34%, 1.6:1). Two of the three suggestions asked each year were better supported now than in 2001, but still lower than in 1998 -- programming to the city's public access channel (61%-50%-53%) and regular publication of city newsletters and mail pieces (73%-65%-72%), although the drop in the latter item was just one percent. Support for allocating funds for expanding telephone accessible information relative to various city services (76%-69%-66%) has declined in each survey. In three of the five City Council districts, all four items were**

supported by majorities, including 52% (city web page) to 84% (publication of city newsletter) in District 1, from 61% (city web page) to 76% (publication of city newsletter) in District 2, and 50% (public access cable channel) to 68% (publication of city newsletter) in District 5. In Districts 3 and 4, where only a plurality supported improvements to the city's public access cable channel (both 49%), the range of majority support was 53% (city web page) to 70% (publication of city newsletter) and 58% (city web page) to 66% (telephone accessible information). (See Tables # 7 - #9, pages 49 - 52.)

- ♦ **Newspapers (57%) were far and away the source people most often utilized to get information. The next three most popular responses were television (17%), word of mouth (8%), and web site/email (5%). The remaining sources survey participants gave were cable channel and radio (both 4%), and newsletters/flyers (3%). Newspapers (60%-55%-57%) and television stations (18%-23%-17%) have been the top two sources from which residents looked to get information, and both have had utilization rates fluctuate from survey to survey. The same was true with the third-rated source, word of mouth (9%-4%-8%). The remaining sources varied little in terms of being used by residents, as findings varied by two percent or less when current findings are compared to either 1998 or 2001 results. The only variance to that trend was the web site, which was not mentioned in the benchmark survey (0%-5%-5%), but has not changed since 2001. Residents in Districts 4 (66%) and 3 (62%) made the most use of newspapers, followed by 58% in District 5, 51% in District 1, and just 42% in District 2, a difference of 24 points when compared to the highest ratings. There was also significant variance when it came to utilizing television (31% in District 2, to 9% in District 5) and word of mouth (16% in District 5, to 5% in District 4). (See Table # 10, page 53.)**
- ♦ **Local newspapers (88%) and local television stations (80%) were listed by four of every five people sampled, the sources most likely to be utilized to get information about Bryan. A majority of respondents also listed word of mouth (78%) and radio (60%). When compared to previous surveys, local newspapers (86%-87%-88%) have shown similar utilization rates in each year. Sources in which utilization has improved since 1998 were word of mouth (66%-75%-78%) and radio (53%-58%-60%) among the more popular sources, and the city web site (11%-22%-30%) and city cable channel (36%-40%-44%) among the secondary sources. In addition, city staff (17%-31%-29%) and City Council (17%-29%-27%) were relied upon more this year than in the benchmark survey. More items in District 2 (six) were utilized by a majority of respondents than anywhere else in the city. In addition to local newspapers (92%), they were local tv stations, also at 90%, as well as word of mouth (79%), city cable channel (66%), and radio (58%). In Districts 1, 3, and 5, four of those sources were utilized by subset**

majorities. Those were local newspapers (87%-88%-93%), local tv stations (80%-82%-76%), word of mouth (83%-82%-82%), and radio (72%-65%-71%). In District 4, fewer than 50% utilized the radio (44%), although majorities did get information from local newspapers (93%), word of mouth (82%), and local tv stations (74%). Variances in utilization abounded throughout the city. Among them were local tv stations being more important in District 2 (90%, to 74% in District 4) and word of mouth capturing more attention from people other than in District 4 (67%, to 8% in District 1 and 82% in Districts 3 and 5). In addition to word of mouth, sources were less often utilized by residents in District 4 than anywhere else. (See Figure 3, page 56.)

City Characteristics And City Services

- ♦ **The fire department (86%-2%, 43.0:1), emergency medical service (80%-5%, 16.0:1), library (80%-10%, 8.0:1), electric (85%-13%, 6.5:1), and police (80%-13%, 6.2:1) were the top five rated services, according to the ratio of positive (good/excellent) to negative (fair/poor) ratings, void of the no opinion response. Respondents were at least four times more positive than negative toward three other items: parks and recreational services (80%-15%, 5.3:1), water/wastewater (77%-16%, 4.8:1), and solid waste/recycling services (77%-19%, 4.1:1). Only one item did not achieve a positive ratio and that was regarding street maintenance (53%-57%, 0.8:1), while two items captured a positive ratio but not a majority -- planning and zoning (47%-37%, 1.3:1), and building inspection (45%-12%, 3.8:1). When compared to the benchmark results, higher scores were noted for planning and zoning (41%-42%-47%), building inspection (41%-45%-45%), solid waste/recycling (73%-74%-77%), and water/wastewater (70%-78%-77%). One other service improved, but by less than three percent, while one, the library, retained its original level (80%-78%-80%). Services that have declined by four percent or more were emergency medical service (84%-77%-80%), police (86%-79%-80%), and street maintenance (50%-26%-43%). The fire department and electric had percentages decline, but by less than three percent. Three of every four residents citywide thought positively about emergency medical service (81%-83%-82%-79%-76%), fire department (89%-93%-77%-77%-89%), library (85%-81%-80%-78%-76%), and electric (83%-87%-84%-87%-85%). The 75% citywide plateau was nearly reached relative to parks and recreational services (85%-85%-82%-73%-81%), solid waste/recycling (78%-82%-73%-79%-72%), and water/wastewater (71%-79%-77%-79%-79%). District 2 appeared to be most positive about city services, as seven of the 11 services were rated positively by a minimum 80%. That compared to five in Districts 1 and 3, three in District 5, and two in District 4. Between 1998**

and 2004, District 2 had more services show gains in positive ratings (10) than elsewhere, being seven in District 1, four in Districts 4 and 5, and two in District 3. Declines in service ratings numbered eight in District 3, seven in District 4, six in District 5, four in District 1, and just one in District 2. (See Tables # 11 - # 13, pages 60 - 65.)

- ♦ **The city providing an adequate water supply, i.e. water pressure and availability (92%-6%, 15.4:1) was the item rated most highly by residents, both in terms of good and excellent marks as well as its quality ratio. Respondents were also highly positive about the city responding to issues caused by sewage overflow (54%-11%, 4.9:1), although a significant percentage (35%) had no opinion on the issue, nor on neighborhood parks (76%-17%, 4.5:1), the top rated item from the previous survey. The remaining items had ratios of 2.3:1 (59%-22% for proper maintenance of medians), 1.4:1 (46%-33% for proper enforcement of code violations), and 0.9:1 (47%-52% for repairing and maintaining streets). When compared to results established in 2001, residents were more positive when it came to evaluating repairing and maintaining streets (38%-47%) and proper maintenance of medians (51%-59%). The other two items had positive ratings decline one percent (code violations) and improve three (neighborhood parks). Variances in quality ratings were evident relative to repairing and maintaining streets (57% in District 3, to 28% in District 1), proper maintenance of medians (66% in District 3, to 46% in District 1), neighborhood parks (86% in District 3, to 67% in District 1), and provides an adequate water supply (96% in District 5, to 80% in District 1). When comparing 2004 to 2001 ratings, attitudes toward all four characteristics improved in Districts 3 and 5. That compared to no gains in Districts 1 and 4, and three of four improvements in District 2. (See Tables # 14 - # 16, pages 67 - 70.)**
- ♦ **Three of four (75%) rated the way the city is maintained good (59%) or excellent (16%). By comparison, fewer than one in four (24%) assessed it as either fair (21%) or poor (3%). The 75% was an improvement over findings generated in 2001 (69%) and was exactly that which was established in the benchmark survey (75%). One positive item was that the excellent rating was higher than any previous mark (11%-9%-16%). Additionally, fair or poor ratings were lower this year than ever before (26%-30%-24%). People in District 3 (76%-74%-85%) were more positive this year than at any other time, the only region to exhibit gains. Comparatively, findings were at their lowest point over the six year period in Districts 1 (75%-71%-67%), 2 (72%-67%-70%) and 5 (65%-61%-59%). And in District 4, quality ratings regained the form assigned in 1998 (77%-73%-77%). Note that the variance in quality ratings was 26 points, double the variance in 2001 (13%) and 1998**

(11%). (See Figure 4, page 71.)

- ♦ **Nearly one-half of all residents sampled (47%) affirmed having contact with a city employee. Comparatively, 47% also said no to having contact, with the remaining 6% choosing the don't remember response. Note that each year, the percentage of residents having had contact with a city employee during the past year has increased (41%-43%-47%).** When compared to previous findings, contact fluctuated most dramatically in District 5 (76%-37%-50%). However, in District 3 (54%-39%-56%), contact rebounded to above the benchmark percentage. Contact has slowly climbed in District 2 (44%-46%-49%), compared to a steep decline in District 4 (57%-48%-41%). In addition, the frequency of contact in District 1 was lower this year than any other time (42%-43%-35%). When compared to 2001, contact increased in Districts 2, 3, and 5, but declined elsewhere. And when compared to 1998, increases were noted in just Districts 2 and 3. (See Figure 5, page 73.)
- ♦ **The courtesy of the person answering the telephone (95%-4%, 23.8:1), directed to the correct department for my concern (90%-8%, 11.3:1), and employee seemed concerned about my problem (87%-11%, 7.9:1) were the customer service statements that attained the highest ratio of satisfaction to dissatisfaction among the 47% of the full-sample who answered the pre-qualifying question affirmatively. Four additional statements attained a ratio of more than six to one: if not available, the correct employee returned my call in a reasonable amount of time (69%-10%, 6.9:1), asked adequate questions to determine the nature of the problem (85%-13%, 6.5:1), the people I worked with showed pride in the work they were doing (85%-13%, 6.5:1), and the problem was adequately resolved by employee responding (83%-13%, 6.4:1). The lowest rated item, at a ratio of three satisfied to one dissatisfied respondent was follow-up from city to ensure my concerns were addressed (65%-21%, 3.1:1). When compared to previous results, people who had contact with city employees were generally more satisfied this year than at any time before. However, the shift in most instances was minor. Since 1998, the ratio has improved for seven of the eight statements, with the only one not improving was being asked adequate questions to determine the nature of the problem (7.2:1-6.5:1). In terms of current ratings, residents from Districts 1 and 2 who had contact with a city employee were less satisfied with their contact than people elsewhere. For example, in District 1, just two statements attained satisfaction ratings of 80% or better. That compared to four statements in District 2, and six in the other three districts. The two plus-80% statements were courtesy of person answering telephone (94%-97%-94%-95%-94%) and asked adequate questions to determine nature of problem (84%-86%-86%-88%-90%). And everywhere but in District**

1, at least four of five were satisfied that the people one worked with showed pride in the work they were doing (69%-83%-86%-86%-91%). (See Tables # 17 - # 19, pages 76 - 82.)

- ♦ **Improved customer service/communication (37%), road improvements (24%), and improved overall city services (14%) were the top three suggestions generated by respondents. Secondary comments included improve trash pickup/recycling and city leadership/council improvements (both 5%), neighborhood beautification and more community involvement (both 3%), and traffic control/more lights (2%). Since 1998, residents have focused more attention on the concerns of road improvements needed (14%-21%-24%) and improved customer service (16%-20%-37%) as how to improve the overall quality of service. Of less concern this year, compared to previous years, was more community involvement (7%-15%-3%) and neighborhood beautification (6%-10%-3%).** Residents in Districts 2 and 3 focused more attention on improved customer service (47% and 43%), compared to Districts 1 and 5 (both 35%), and 4 (30%). The only area to focus as much attention on road improvements as improved customer service was District 4 (30%-28%); elsewhere, there was at least a 13-point separation between the two issues. Road improvements appeared to concern Districts 3 and 4 more than anyone else (27% and 28%), and especially more than respondents in District 1 (18%). The issue of improved city services was also more focused in District 4 than anywhere else (23%, to 8% in District 2). (See Table # 20, page 84.)
- ♦ **"I am satisfied with living in Bryan" (95%-5%, 19.0:1) was the positive statement in 2004 with which residents were in most agreement. Affirmative opinions were also very high for "we have an excellent work force" (83%-9%, 6.2:1) and "my neighborhood receives sufficient city services" (79%-19%, 4.2:1). At the same time, the negative statements were strongly disputed, although 31% agreed that "I am frustrated with how city government works in Bryan" (31%-61%, 0.3:1) and 20% that "I don't feel I can ever get a straight answer from the city if I have a problem" (20%-70%, 0.3:1). In comparing the statements to previous findings, we note the continued growth in agreeing that one was frustrated with how city government works in Bryan (23%-26%-31%), an increase of eight points since the benchmark survey. No other item sustained either growth or diminished percentages of more than three percent when comparing current and benchmark results. In reviewing the agreement ratios for both 1998 and 2004, the ratio was higher this year regarding being satisfied with living in Bryan (13.1:1-19.0:1) and having an excellent workforce (6.2:1-9.3:1). Interestingly, there was no change in the statement about one's neighborhood receiving sufficient city services (4.2:1-4.2:1). There was some growth in the negative statement about being frustrated with how city**

government works (0.3:1-0.5:1) but not with getting a straight answer from the city if one has a problem (0.3:1-0.3:1). District 1 was the region least likely to say that their neighborhood receives sufficient city services, at 63%, compared to percentages of 75% (District 2), 76% (District 5), 84% (District 4), and 87% (District 3). The same trend was evident relative to having an excellent city workforce, with lower percentages in District 1 (71%) compared with any other part of the city (89%-88%-85%-83%). Relative to the two negative statements, it was Districts 1 and 2 who most often agreed to being frustrated with how city government works in Bryan (39% and 35%), although percentages in other parts of the district (27%-29%-30%) were not dramatically different. (See Tables #21 - #23, pages 87 - 91.)

Trending Quality Of Life And City-Related Initiatives

- ♦ **Safety/security (25%) was the primary element that best described quality of life, according to survey participants. Also important elements were nice community (16%) and family/people (12%). In comparing these results to previous surveys, the most important point is the continuing emphasis residents place on safety/security (27%-24%-25%). One element that appears to be gaining in prominence is nice community (9%-13%-16%). Also more important this year was peace/quiet (6%-3%-9%), although most of the gains for this item came between 2001 and 2004. And in successive years, less emphasis has been placed on religion/faith (11%-6%-5%) as a quality of life element.** Safety/security appeared to be more important to residents in Districts 5 (35%) and 1 (30%), with other percentages ranging from 15% (District 2) to 24% (District 3). People in District 2 less frequently said nice community was an element (9%), compared to percentages of 22% in District 1 and 19% in District 5. Note that these two sections of the city, Districts 1 and 5, were most prominent when it came to the two top responses of safety/security and nice community. Note that safety/security, even with its variance, was the top element throughout the city. And the second most mentioned item, except in District 2, was nice community. The third ranked item varied throughout. (See Table #24, page 94.)
- ♦ **Providing a safe community (99%-0%, 99.0:1), planning for future needs of residents (97%-1%, 97.0:1), and working with the school district (97%-1%, 97.0:1) were the statements shown by the ratio of important to unimportant to be most important in determining the quality of life of a community. Overall, seven of the ten statements attained overall importance ratings of 90% or better. In addition to the three were maintaining a qualified workforce of city employees (98%-2%, 49.0:1), keeping citizens informed about city business (96%-2%, 48.0:1), providing an adequate forum for public input (95%-2%, 47.5:1), and enforcing neighborhood beautification**

efforts (91%-8%, 11.4:1). The ratios for the three remaining items were all higher than six to one: 8.0:1 (88%-11% for providing adequate community events); 7.1:1 (85%-12% for encouraging cultural diversity among residents); and 6.6:1 (85%-13% for providing public transportation). In comparing 1998 and 2004 ratings, no item varied by more than two percent, positively or negatively. Elements that have generated minimum four percent higher very important percentages between the benchmark and current survey findings numbered eight, with five being gradual improvements: maintaining a qualified workforce (36%-46%-52%, +16), planning for future needs of residents (45%-48%-58%, +13), providing public transportation (22%-31%-35%, +13), working with the school district (48%-53%-58%, +10), and providing an adequate forum for public input (34%-39%-43%, +9). This year's survey results show residents everywhere but in District 1 rank providing a safe community as the most important element in determining quality of life in a community. The item of most importance there was working with the school district, followed by planning for the future needs of residents, and then providing a safe community. It should be noted that just two percentage points separated the first through third items in that part of the city. The second ranked element was planning for the future needs of residents to people in Districts 3 and 5, compared to maintaining a qualified workforce of city employees to those in Districts 2 and 4. Out of ten possible items, the 90% importance plateau was reached eight times in District 1, compared to nine in District 2, six in Districts 3 and 4, and seven in District 5. (See Tables #25 - #27, pages 97 - 102.)

- ♦ **Providing city facilities for community events (88%-6%, 14.7:1), providing a safe community (92%-7%, 13.1:1), and maintaining a qualified workforce of city employees (85%-7%, 12.0:1) were the elements which generated the highest degree of satisfaction to dissatisfaction from survey participants. Respondents were satisfied with each of the described activities, as the item with which they were least satisfied, enforcing neighborhood beautification efforts, still captured a positive ratio of 3.3:1 (75%-18%). The ratios for the other activities were 7.1:1 (69%-11% for working with the school district), 5.4:1 (76%-15% for providing an adequate forum for public input), 4.7:1 (69%-15% for planning for future needs of residents), and 4.0:1 (67%-19% for keeping citizens informed about city business). When reviewed by combined satisfaction ratings, no item varied by more than two percent, positively or negatively. Although each of the variances falls within the standard margin of error, three services increased one percent, two decreased by one and two points, and three remained the same. Three elements did display a higher level of intense response, those being providing a safe community (22%-27%), providing city facilities for community events (11%-18%), and planning for future needs of residents (7%-11%). All others shifted in one manner or the other by two percent or**

less, indicating that the city has maintained the high level of satisfaction established in the original survey. In Districts 2 and 3, five activities respectively attained satisfaction from at least 80% of residents. That compared to four in District 5, three in District 4, and two in District 1. Two activities scored 80% or better citywide, providing a safe community (82%-90%-94%-96%-93%) and providing city facilities for community events (93%-90%-92%-84%-87%). One item was one percentage point short of achieving that mark, that being maintaining a qualified workforce of city employees (79%-85%-88%-87%-82%). Residents everywhere except District 1 assigned the highest level of satisfaction to the element providing a safe community. People in District 1 thought more of providing city facilities for community events (93%) than providing a safe community (82%). (See Tables # 28 - # 30, pages 104 - 109.)

- ♦ **Overwhelmingly, residents voiced the highest degree of agreement to the governance statement "trash and garbage are collected and appropriately disposed of in a timely manner" (95%-4%, 23.8:1). Second tier ratings were accorded to three other statements in which agreement was at or above the 70 percentile: "neighborhood entrances are easily accessible and identifiable" (75%-20%, 3.8:1), "neighborhood entrances are symbolic of the character of the city or neighborhood" (69%-22%, 3.1:1), and "the city provides appropriate recycling" (70%-23%, 3.0:1). The three remaining statements attained a ratio of 2.0:1 (58%-29% for "citizens participate in planning and decision-making"), 2.0:1 (65%-32% for "people take responsibility for the appearance of the city"), and 1.0:1 (44%-41% for "citizens in Bryan recycle appropriately"), the only item to not score majority agreement ratings, although it did achieve plurality favorable findings. Of the statements first presented to respondents in 1998, agreement has gradually increased relative to the trash and garbage collection statement (90%-91%-95%), as well as the neighborhood entrances being accessible and identifiable (70%-72%-75%). For the two other statements, more improvement was noted about people taking responsibility for the appearance of the city (76%-58%-65%) than for citizens participating in planning and decision-making (64%-55%-58%). Of the three statements first included in the 2001 survey, agreement increased five (39%-44% for citizens recycle appropriately), four (65%-69% for neighborhood entrances are symbolic of the character of the city), and three (67%-70% for city providing appropriate recycling) percent, respectively. Ninety percent of residents citywide agreed in 2004 that trash and garbage are collected and appropriately disposed of in a timely manner (94%-91%-93%-96%-99%). Overall, District 1 appeared to be most positive about the respective statements, as percentages exceeded 80% three times. That compared to twice in District 2 and only once everywhere else. District 5 respondents were most likely to voice**

disagreement with several of the statements as presented, especially about recycling and citizen participation. (See Tables # 31 - # 33, pages 111 - 117.)

- ♦ **Sixty-eight percent either agreed (59%) or agreed strongly (9%) that people value cultural diversity, compared to 24% who either disagreed (22%) or strongly disagreed (2%). An additional 7% of the sample chose the no opinion response, resulting in a ratio of agreement to disagreement of 2.8:1. The current rating was exactly that voiced in 2001 (68%-68%), although this year more people strongly agreed (6%-9%) and fewer strongly disagreed (5%-2%). The ratio this year was slightly higher than that voiced in 2001 (2.6:1). Overall agreement between 2001 and 2004 varied significantly in Districts 1 and 2. In District 1, residents were less likely to agree with it, as agreement declined 13 points (76%-63%). The opposite was true in District 2, where a higher percentage of respondents agreed with the cultural diversity statement (58%-67%). Comparatively, in Districts 3 (77%-78%) District 4 (67%-68%), and District 5 (64%-65%), there was no statistical variance. (See Figure 6, page 119.)**
- ♦ **Curbside recycling (30%), public transportation (12%), and more recreational activities and an athletic complex/recreation center (both 9%) were the top open-ended choices as services or facilities people would like to see the city provide which it currently does not. Other secondary suggestions included city leadership/services (7%), services for the elderly (5%), and street maintenance (4%). Several different types of recreational facilities were also suggested, namely a theme park/stadium/zoo (6%), community pool/water park (4%), bike paths (2%), and ice skating/hockey (2%). Fewer people answered this question (161) than in either 1998 (266) or 2001 (181), an indication that each year people are having more and more difficulty or are more reluctant to give an answer. The percentages suggesting curbside recycling (23%-28%-30%) and public transportation (4%-8%-12%) continues to climb. One response declined when compared to 2001, although not relative to 1998 and that was more recreational activities (8%-17%-9%). The need for an athletic complex/recreation center remained consistent since 2001 (NA-10%-9%) when it was first raised. The scientific accuracy of these responses, especially when quantified by the geographic subsets, is limited because of the number of collected comments, which ranged from 46 in District 4 down to 19 in District 2. However, curbside recycling was far and away the number one suggestion, with an average rating of 30%. It was first in District 5, at 43%, in District 3 at 36%, in District 4 at 25%, and in District 1 at 22%. However, the 11% who suggested this item in District 2 made it the third highest rated suggestion. More popular suggestions in that part of the city were athletic complex/recreation center (26%) and more recreational activities (21%). In addition, 11% also mentioned city leadership/services and theme**

park/stadium/zoo. Also note that the citywide variance relative to the primary response was 32%. Public transportation ranked second overall, with responses that ranged from 16% in District 5 to 5% in District 2. (See Table # 34, page 121.)

- ♦ **Forty-two percent of the full sample rated taxes paid to the school district either high or very high. That compared to lower percentages who assigned similar ratings to city (32%) or county (30%) taxes. One-half of the sample (50%) believed that both city and school district taxes were about right, ten points higher than the rating given to school taxes (40%). For each taxing entity, approximately one in five had no opinion as to the rating of taxes they paid. When this is compared to previous marks, note that residents were more critical of school taxes than ever before (33%-33%-42%), as high and very high ratings jumped nearly ten percent. Comparatively, city (31%-28%-32%) and county (27%-26%-30%) have shown minimal variance over the past six years. However, the same was not true with about right or low ratings, which have gradually declined for each taxing entity in each survey year. The decline was most pronounced with school district taxes (51%-47%-40%), compared to more minor declines regarding county taxes (57%-53%-50%) and even more so relative to city taxes (53%-51%-50%). Current findings showed District 4 most concerned with school district taxes (49%, to 38% in District 1), compared to District 1 focusing on the amount of taxes paid to both the city (37%, to 30% in Districts 2 and 5) and the county (39%, to 26% in District 2). Note that plus ten-point variances were evident regarding both school district and county taxes, whereas the ratings for city taxes were more consensus-like. District 1 was consistent in their concerns with taxes paid to all three entities, as just two percent separated the high and low rating. The variance in the other districts ranged between 10% and 13%. Also, District 1 was the only region to assign higher high ratings to an entity other than the school district. (See Tables # 35 - # 37, pages 124 - 126.)**
- ♦ **Residents were as likely to rate the overall performance of the current City Council good or excellent (45%) as fair or poor (42%). In terms of intense ratings, the negative (poor) opinion was twice the positive (10%-5%). The remaining 13% of the sample had no opinion when asked to respond to this question. The 45% positive rating assigned in 2004 is significantly lower than at any time -- 1998 (65%) or 2001 (62%). Additionally, excellent ratings declined (9%-7%-5%) while poor ratings increased (3%-7%-10%). Fair or poor findings, which increased by six percent between 1998 and 2001 (23%-29%) jumped to 42% according to this year's results. For comparison purposes, the ratio in 1998 was 2.8:1 but has fallen to 1.1:1 in 2004. In 2001, the ratio was 2.1:1. Good and excellent ratings declined in all five City Council districts. The decline was greatest in Districts 4 (73%-61%-45%, -28%)**

and 5 (67%-61%-40%, -27), where positive marks decreased by more than 25 points. Comparatively, the declines in Districts 2 (59%-58%-42%, -17), 3 (61%-65%-53%, -12) and 1 (53%-59%-44%, -9) were lower, although still 10 percent plus. Negative opinions of the current council performance were consistent throughout the city, ranging from 39% (District 3) up to 45% (District 1). (See Figure 7, page 127.)

- ♦ **Maintaining quality of life (76%-10%, 7.6:1) and providing adequate forums for public input (71%-15%, 4.7:1) were the council-related activities in which residents voiced the highest level of satisfaction to dissatisfaction. Overall, each activity received a satisfaction rating at least twice the dissatisfaction level. Four other activities achieved a ratio of better than three to one: planning for the future needs of residents (64%-18%, 3.6:1), encouraging economic growth (67%-19%, 3.5:1), working among themselves to promote the community (66%-20%, 3.3:1), and developing effective land use regulations (56%-18%, 3.1:1). The remaining two items scored a satisfaction ratio of 2.1:1 (52%-25% for managing city funds) and 2.0:1 (55%-27% for working to keep taxes reasonable). In terms of trending from the benchmark results, each item rated lower in 2004, with the drop greatest for three activities: working among themselves to promote the community (81%-78%-66%), encouraging economic growth (82%-75%-67%), and managing city funds (67%-58%-52%). The two items in which dissatisfaction varied the least over the past six years were developing effective land use regulations (57%-63%-56%) and providing adequate forums for public input (74%-72%-71%). The satisfaction ratio shows residents less satisfied with several statements, most noticeably the council working among themselves to promote the community (11.6:1 in 1998, to 3.3:1 in 2004) and encouraging economic growth (9.1:1, to 3.5:1). Districts 1 and 3 appeared to be most satisfied in terms of current ratings, as five items achieved satisfaction ratings of 70% or better. That compared to three in District 2, one in District 4, and zero in District 5. Everywhere but in District 5, 70% of respondents were satisfied with how the council was maintaining quality of life (75%-80%-81%-76%-69%), with the remaining percentage one point short. And reaching the 70% plateau in three of the five districts were encouraging economic growth (76%-73%-72%-62%-59%), and providing adequate forums for public input (74%-74%-71%-69%-66%). The number one ranked item in all but District 1 was maintaining quality of life, which ranked second there, as they were more satisfied with the council's encouraging economic growth. (See Tables # 38 - #40, pages 130 - 135.)**
- ♦ **Keep taxes from increasing (30%), followed by encouraging economic development (21%) and improve quality of streets (20%) were the issues identified as being most important for Bryan to work on during the next year. Also of importance was the issue maintain emphasis on public safety**

(17%). Issues of minimal importance, based on the findings, were be more responsive to citizens (8%) and improve city services (4%). Keeping taxes from increasing regained its position as the most important issue for the city to work on, overtaking street improvements, which was the top-ranked response in 2001. When comparing current and previous results, the one that has increased in importance each time has been encouraging economic development (17%-18%-21%). In addition, keeping taxes from increasing (26%-21%-30%) was higher than the two previous surveys, although the increase was not gradual. Two issues that were less important today than when first introduced in 1998 were improving quality of streets (22%-32%-20%) and maintaining emphasis on public safety (25%-16%-17%). Keeping taxes from increasing was identified as the most important issue in four of the five City Council districts. That included District 3 (39%), the subsector most apt to generate this response, as well as Districts 1 (37%), 2 (36%), and 4 (26%). In District 5, keeping taxes from increasing (19%) was only fourth on the priority listing, behind encouraging economic development (30%), maintain emphasis on public safety (21%), and improve quality of streets (20%). Improving quality of streets (29%) and maintaining emphasis on public safety ranked second and third in District 1, while these two issues flip-flopped in terms of prioritization in District 2, with scores of 21% and 15%. Encouraging economic development (24%) was the second most important issue to residents in District 3, followed by improving quality of streets (15%). As in Districts 1 and 2, these two issues (economic development and streets) ranked third and second in District 4. Additionally, maintaining quality of streets ranked fourth in both Districts 3 and 4.